

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Meyer et al.

Title: BONDING AND
INTERCONNECT TO A CIRCUIT
DEVICE AND RELATED
DEVICES

Appl. No.: 10/822,064

Filing Date: 04/08/2004

Examiner: Chang, Rick Kiltae

Art Unit: 3726

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the
United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, Virginia
on the date below.

Todd A. Rathe

(Printed Name)

(Signature)

(Date of Deposit)

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed on August 13, 2007.

I. Restriction Requirement

Section 2 of the Office Action imposed a restriction requirement on the claims asserting
that the claims are directed to the following distinct inventions:

- I. Species 1 drawn to Figure 10;
- II. Species II drawn to Figure 12 and

III. Species 3 drawn to Figure 13.

II. Improper Restriction Requirement

Applicants respectfully note that the finality of the previous restriction requirement is improper as the Examiner has in effect issued a new restriction requirement. Given the new restriction requirement, Applicants further respectfully note that the list of pending claims set forth in the Office Action is incorrect. Applicants presume that the previous restriction requirement has been withdrawn in favor the new restriction requirement. Thus, at the present time, no claims have been withdrawn from consideration.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully note that the restriction requirement is still improper as failing to group all embodiments into species. MPEP 808.01(a) specifies that "in making a requirement for restriction in an application claiming plural species, the examiner should group together species considered clearly unpatentable over each other, with the statement that restriction as between those species is not required." The Examiner has failed to address the embodiment shown in Figures 15-17. Nevertheless, to move prosecution forward, as noted below, Applicants have elected species II, Figure 12 without further traverse.

III. Election

With this response, Applicants hereby elect Species II, drawn to Figure 12. At least claims 1-9, 12-19, 21 and 25-29, 31-39 and 41-55 read upon Species II, Figure 12. At least claims 1-8, 15-16, and 18 are believed to be generic to each of Species I-III. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications pursuing the non-elected claims.

IV. Request for Associating Reference Numerals with Claim Limitations

Section 4 of the Office Action repeated previous requests that reference numerals be associated with claim limitations. During the Examiner Interview held on January 7, 2007, the Examiner indicated that such request was optional. Once again, although Applicants would like

to satisfy the Examiner's request for such a list, Applicants concern is that such a list would potentially be construed to unduly limit the scope of the claims. Therefore, Applicants wish to refrain from making such a list of record. However, Applicants would be willing to provide the Examiner with the requested associated reference numerals during a telephonic interview to assist the Examiner with associating example structures in the disclosure with the claimed limitations. Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned to set up such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Sept. 13, 2007

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276